

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

**INGA DOW,**  
**Plaintiff,**

**V.**

**KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY, INC.,  
JOHN DAVIS, GO MANAGEMENT, LLC,  
DAVID OSBORN, SMOKEY GARRETT,  
AND GARY KELLER,**

## Defendants.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:21-cv-01209-P**

**DEFENDANTS KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY, INC. AND GARY KELLER’S**  
**BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STRIKE**  
**SUBJECT TO MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION**

inflammatory, time-barred sexual harassment allegations going back more than two decades—allegations that by her own admission could not have occurred past December 2018, when she contends the alleged harasser, John Davis, left KWRI. [Dkt. 1, ¶ 3.89]. As noted in KWRI and Keller’s motion to dismiss (incorporated herein by reference), the allegations based on the alleged conduct of Davis are facially time barred. The allegations in this lawsuit that do not relate to the alleged sexual harassment stem from Dow’s dissatisfaction as a business owner with various factors impacting her businesses—matters that are unrelated to the exceedingly stale and inflammatory sexual harassment allegations.

For the reasons set forth below, Defendants seek to strike the following paragraphs from Dow’s Complaint:

- Dkt. 1, ¶ 3.18 through ¶ 3.74; and
- Dkt. 1, ¶ 3.93 through ¶ 3.99.

## **II.**

### **ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITIES**

Rule 12(f) provides that “[t]he court may strike from a pleading an insufficient defense or any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter.” FED. R. CIV. P. 12(f). FRCP 12(f) is designed to reinforce the requirement in FRCP 8(e)(1) that pleadings be simple, concise, and direct. *Sefton v. Jew*, 204 F.R.D. 104, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21714 (W.D. Tex. 2000), App. 18-25. “Scandalous matter is that which improperly casts a derogatory light on someone, most typically on a party to the action.” *Pierce v. Sys. Grp.*, No. 19-138, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182591, \* 5 (E.D. La. Oct. 1, 2020), App. 14-17. “The purpose of striking scandalous matter ‘is aimed, in part, at avoiding prejudice to a party by preventing a jury from seeing the offensive matter or giving the allegations any other unnecessary notoriety inasmuch as, once filed, pleading[s] generally are public documents and become generally available.’” *Id.* at \*5, 6. Courts have

significant discretion in ruling on a motion to strike. *Id.* at \*4. Motions to strike are proper “where the allegations to be stricken have no possible relation to the claims or causes of action. All doubts are resolved against striking the pleadings.” *Bates v. Laminack*, 938 F. Supp. 2d 649, 668 (S.D. Tex. 2013) (internal citations omitted); *Bryant v. Lubbock Indep. Sch. Dist.*, Civil Action No. 5:04-CV-083-C, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7184, at \*11-12 (N.D. Tex. 2004), App. 1-13. While motions to strike are generally disfavored, “the disfavored character of Rule 12(f) is relaxed somewhat in the context of scandalous allegations and matters of this type often will be stricken from the pleadings in order to purge the court’s files and protect the person who is the subject of the allegations.” 5C C. Wright and A. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure (Civil)* 2d § 1382, at 466-67 (2004).

Here, the inflammatory matter at issue relates to salacious alleged acts by Davis, including an alleged crime for which Dow has shown no evidence of conviction. This type of allegation undoubtably casts Davis, who is the alleged bad actor and a party to the action, and by extension the other defendants, in a derogatory light. *See Pierce*, No. 19-138, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182591, at \*5, App. 14-17. Further, given the numerous defenses to these allegations noted in the pending motions to dismiss—including a glaringly obvious statute of limitations defense—allowing the offensive allegations to stand is particularly harmful, as they serve no proper purpose. Striking the noted portions of the complaint is needed to avoid undue prejudice by preventing a jury from seeing the offensive matter or giving the allegations any other unnecessary notoriety given that pleadings are generally public documents once filed. *See Pierce*, No. 19-138, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182591, at \*5, 6, App. 14-17. Finally, if the inflammatory allegations are set aside, it is easier to see the dispute for what it is: Dow attempting to gain leverage in matters impacting her

businesses.<sup>1</sup> She should not be able to use the legal process to advance facially stale and inflammatory harassment allegations (under statutes that do not apply to her) to embarrass the defendants. Defendants accordingly move to strike the allegations contained in Paragraphs 3.18-3.74 and 3.93-3.99 of the Complaint pursuant to FRCP 12(f).

### **III.** **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth above, Defendants KWRI and Gary Keller request that this motion be granted, that the Court strike all immaterial, impertinent, and scandalous matter from the complaint pursuant to Rule 12(f), and that Defendants be awarded such other and further relief to which they may be entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Kristin L. Bauer

Kristin L. Bauer

Texas Bar No. 24006813

[Kristin.Bauer@jacksonlewis.com](mailto:Kristin.Bauer@jacksonlewis.com)

Claire L. Cook

Texas Bar No. 24086220

[Clair.Cook@jacksonlewis.com](mailto:Clair.Cook@jacksonlewis.com)

JACKSON LEWIS P.C.

500 N. Akard, Suite 2500

Dallas, Texas 75201

PH: (214) 520-2400

FX: (214) 520-2008

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS  
KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY, INC.  
AND GARY KELLER**

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, Dow complains about the selection of her operating partner [Dkt. 1, ¶¶ 3.81-82], her participation in a “legacy” program [Dkt. 1, ¶ 3.82], or in her estimation, her getting lowballed by Defendants Osborn and Garrett on the potential sale of her businesses [Dkt. 1, ¶ 3.83].

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been served on all counsel of record in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on March 1, 2022.

Michael Y. Kim  
Ericha Ramsey Brown  
Monica L. Narvaez  
Eduardo R. Garza  
THE MICHAEL KIM LAW FIRM,  
PLLC  
4236 W. Lovers Lane  
Dallas, Texas 75209  
[mkim@mkimlegal.com](mailto:mkim@mkimlegal.com)  
[erbrown@mkimlegal.com](mailto:erbrown@mkimlegal.com)  
[mnarvaez@mkimlegal.com](mailto:mnarvaez@mkimlegal.com)  
[egarza@mkimlegal.com](mailto:egarza@mkimlegal.com)

**Attorneys for Plaintiff**

James T. Drakeley  
Laurie N. Patton  
SPENCER FANE LLP  
5700 Granite Parkway, Ste.  
650  
Plano, TX 75024  
[jdrakeley@spencerfane.com](mailto:jdrakeley@spencerfane.com)  
[lpattson@spencerfane.com](mailto:lpattson@spencerfane.com)

**Attorneys for Defendant  
John Davis**

A. Boone Almanza  
Tanya Robinson  
ALMANZA, BLACKBURN, DICKIE  
& MITCHELL LLP  
2301 S. Capital of Texas Hwy.,  
Bldg. H  
Austin, Texas 78746  
[TRobinson@abdmlaw.com](mailto:TRobinson@abdmlaw.com)  
[BAmanza@abdmlaw.com](mailto:BAmanza@abdmlaw.com)

**Attorneys For Defendants  
Go Management LLC, David  
Osborn, And Smokey Garrett**

/s/ Kristin Bauer  
Kristin L. Bauer